



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,279	07/08/2003	Jeff Korn	12258-036001	8225
26161	7590	05/19/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			JUNG, WILLIAM C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3768	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/615,279	Applicant(s) KORN, JEFF	
	Examiner William Jung	Art Unit 3768	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed February 13, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After further consideration of the applicant's argument examiner respectfully disagrees.

In regards to double patenting rejection, the applicant argues (remarks page 2) that pending claim recites "lens disposed inside the housing to intercept a rotating collection beam emerging from the eccentric port" and no such a claim is apparent in Zuluaga. Examiner would like to point out "a collimating lens within the housing to guide the second beam entering the housing at the eccentric port toward the detector mounted on an inner wall of the housing" as stated in claim 4. In addition, claim 6 disclose the invention where the detector or second beam being emerged from eccentric aperture as housing spins, i.e. rotating. Therefore, Zuluaga et al claims substantially identical invention as claimed in current application.

In regards to rejection under 102(f), see reasoning for double patenting rejection above.

In regards to rejection under 102(e), applicant's argument is ineffective. The port as disclosed by the applicant as well as in Seibel is nothing more than physical aperture or collimator allowing the light or reflecting lights to pass through. And since the lens are part of the housing in Siebel and in the applicant's claim, the rotation of the housing causes rotation in lens and the detector as well.

Therefore, examiner maintains the previous rejection dated January 22, 2006 and repeated below.

### ***Double Patenting***

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-16 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,895,137 B2 (*Zuluaga et al*). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-16 in current application regarding optical coupler comprising a housing with a rotatable distal face and stationary proximal face, the distal face having eccentric port and a central port, a lens disposed inside the housing to intercept a rotating collection beam emerging from the eccentric port and to re-direct the collection beam to a focus proximal to the lens as the collection beam rotates, and a beam re-director being oriented to direct a delivery beam toward the central port are claimed in claims 1-22 in US Pat. No. 6,895,137. Although the wording of the claims is not identical, the claimed invention is identical.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1-16 in current application regarding optical coupler comprising a housing with a rotatable distal face and stationary proximal face, the distal face having eccentric port and a central port, a lens disposed inside the housing to intercept a rotating collection beam emerging from the eccentric port and to re-direct the collection beam to a focus proximal to the lens as the collection beam rotates, and a beam re-director being oriented to direct a delivery beam toward the central port are claimed in claims 1-22 in US Pat. No. 6,895,137 with different inventive entity (no common inventors) but assigned to a common assignee.

6. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Seibel* (US 6,975,898 B2).

***Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 11, and 15:*** Seibel discloses an optical coupler comprising a housing 238 with a rotatable distal face 204 and stationary proximal face, 208 the distal face having eccentric port and a central port 202, a lens disposed inside the housing to intercept a rotating collection beam emerging from the eccentric port and to re-direct the collection beam to a focus

Art Unit: 3768

proximal to the lens as the collection beam rotates, and a beam re-director being oriented to direct a delivery beam toward the central port and the rotation of the distal face is about the central port 202 (col. 13, line 9 – col. 14, line 13).

**Claims 3-5, 9, 12-14, and 16:** Seibel also discloses that the beam re-director comprises prism 272 (col. 16, lines 40-58) and a mirror 352, 354, 356 (col. 18, lines 49-65). The purpose of using penta-prism is not defined therefore; it is merely a design choice in shape of the prism.

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Jung, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-4739. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

Art Unit: 3768

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eleni Mantis-Mercader can be reached on 571-272-4740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



May 4, 2006

  
ELENI MANTIS-MERCADER, SPE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER